REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain in this application. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 4 and 12 are rewritten in the manner referred to in section 3 on page 3 of the Office Action and should now be allowable. Claim 5, which depends on claim 4, and claim 13, which depends on claim 12, should be allowable as well.

Independent claims 1 and 9 "insofar as definite" are rejected, along with various dependent claims, as anticipated by newly applied Japanese document 3-199103 to Yamamoto. Reconsideration is requested. Claims 1 and 9 are considered fully in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the Examiner's use of the phrase "insofar as definite" is unclear. While the Examiner asserts in this rejection that a "method for using" the device forming the subject matter of the Yamamoto document includes "providing a normalizing stage in the form of a heat exchanger ... that adjusts the temperature of the vaporized gas flow to an optimum temperature ...," moreover, it is unclear from the rejection which elements of the device illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of the Yamamoto document the Examiner considers to be the "normalizing stage" referred to in the rejection.

In any event, claims 1 and 9 are amended above in order to more particularly define the structure and operation of the normalizing stage illustrated by way of example in Figures 2 and 3 of the present application. Support for the new language in currently amended claims 1 and 9 is provided by the description set

forth, for example, in specification paragraphs 26-30. It is respectfully submitted that no evidence is provided that the Yamamoto document relied on discloses or suggests a gas generation system comprising, in addition to other elements, a normalizing stage connected between an evaporator and a reformer including a primary side where temperature valleys and peaks of the gas flow are equalized to within a temperature range below a maximal allowable reformer inlet temperature and a secondary side via which heat is supplied to the primary side as currently amended claim 1 defines. It is also submitted that no evidence is provided that the Yamamoto device illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of the document relied on operates by performing the particular acts or operations of equalizing, with a primary side of a normalizing stage connected between an evaporator and a reformer, temperature valleys and peaks of a gas flow to be supplied to the reformer to within a temperature range below a maximal allowable reformer inlet temperature before the gas flow is introduced into the reformer, and supplying heat to the primary side via a secondary side of the normalizing stage as currently amended claim 9 defines.

Independent claims 1 and 9 as they appear above are considered patentable along with claims 4, 5, 12, and 13 for reasons discussed above. Claims 2, 3, and 6-8, which depend on claim 1, and claims 10, 11, and 14-16, which depend on claim 9, are patentable as well. All claims in this application, therefore, should now be patentable.

This application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions after consideration of this Reply, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 17, 2005

Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd